

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-22 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-6 and 8-25 stand rejected. Claims 23-25 have been cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-11 and 15-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zicker (U.S. Pat. No. 5,995,833, hereinafter Zicker) in view of Moore (U.S. Pat. No. 5,450,617, hereinafter Moore) and Ronald (U.S. Pat. No. 5,880,867, hereinafter Ronald). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants note independent Claim 1 includes "each network access point being accessible wirelessly by a predetermined number of user portable electronic devices per network access point . . . wherein each of the network access points is configured to transmit signals to and receive signals from a portable electronic device within a cell area on a mobile platform, and is further configured to transmit signals to and receive signals from a portable electronic device roaming into the cell area on the mobile platform from a cell area on the mobile platform associated with another of the access points." Applicants respectfully submit this feature is not taught nor suggested by Zicker, Moore, or Ronald either alone or in combination.

As noted previously, Zicker appears to disclose the roaming of a cell phone user between his home system and a remote system on the vehicle of Zicker. It does not teach nor suggest whatsoever the user's device roaming between spaced apart access

points on the same vehicle as claimed nor the requirement of providing access only to "a predetermined number of user portable electronic devices per network access point." Moore further fails to teach or suggest Applicants' invention as claimed. With respect to Ronald, Applicants note Ronald teaches a communication system using an infrared or radio frequency transmission device mounted on a ceiling of a building. Applicants note there are substantial differences in a system for a mobile platform and one for a building, in particular, the possibility of interference to mobile platform systems from portable electronic devices (PEDs) that might be used by passengers to make wireless connections to an on-board network. Of particular concern is the possibility of PED interference during critical phases of transit. In addition, Ronald also does not limit accessibility to each access point to only a predetermined number of portable devices as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert Claim 1 is patentable and in condition for allowance. In addition, as Claims 2-11 and 15 depend from independent Claim 1 these claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

With regard to independent Claim 16, Applicants note this claim includes "enabling wireless access to a wide area network, by a predetermined number of user portable electronic devices per access point." Applicants also submit Zicker and Moore fail to teach or suggest this feature as claimed and as discussed previously. In particular, Zicker appears to disclose an airborne cell phone network and not a wireless local area network for a mobile platform which "enables wireless access to a wide area network." Moore also fails to teach or suggest Applicants' invention as claimed. In addition, Ronald is silent as to enabling wireless access to a wide area network onboard

a mobile platform. Thus, Ronald also does not teach or suggest Applicants' invention and further Ronald cannot be readily modified to teach Applicants' invention. Thus, Applicants assert independent Claim 16 is patentable and in condition for allowance. In addition, as Claims 17-22 depend from independent Claim 16, Claims 17-22 are also believed to be patentable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zicker, Moore and Ronald in view of Wright (U.S. Pat. No. 6,047,165). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants note Claims 8 and 9 both depend from independent Claim 1. As stated previously, Applicants believe Claim 1 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants believe Claims 8 and 9 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 22, 23 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zicker in view of Wright. As claims 23-25 have been cancelled this rejection is moot. With regard to claim 22, Applicants note this claim depends from independent claim 16 which is believed to be in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicants believe Claim 22 is also in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 12 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zicker, Moore and Ronald in view of Rautiola (U.S. Pat. No. 5,924,030). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants note Claim 12 depends from independent Claim 1, while Claim 24 has been cancelled. As stated previously, Applicants believe Claim 1 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants believe Claim 12 is also patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zicker, Moore and Ronald in view of Wright. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants note Claims 13 and 14 both depend from independent Claim 1. As stated previously, Applicants believe Claim 1 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants believe Claims 13 and 14 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt

and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 23, 2004
HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

By: Mark D. Elchuk
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

MDE/EKS/ps